

MINUTES
of the
Mental Health Planning Advisory Council
meeting on
October 16, 2003
held at
State of Nevada
Department of Human Resources
Kinkead Building, Room 601
505 E. King Street
Carson City, NV 89701

I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, INTRODUCTIONS

Alyce Thomas, Chair of the Council, called the meeting to order at 10:15 am.

Members present:

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| • Bennett, Bob | • Lovass-Nagy, Chris (for Richard Whitley) |
| • Clark, Jerry | • Parra, Debbie |
| • Cooley, Judge W. | • Rodriguez, Jenita |
| • Crowe, Kevin | • Karen Taycher |
| • Dopf, Gloria | • Thomas, Alyce |
| • Jackson, Barbara | • Uptergrove, Anna |
| • Legier, Barbara | • Wherry, Mary |

Members absent:

- Johnson, Rosetta

Staff and others in attendance:

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| • Caloiaro, Dave – MHDS | • Zeiser, Andrew– Administrative Consultant |
|-------------------------|---|

Alyce Thomas announced to the members that Nancy Aitken has resigned. Alyce then discussed her own change in membership representation from being a parent of a child to a parent of an adult, given that her son is about to age out of the system. Judge Cooley recommended that Nancy be given a certificate of appreciation. Alyce suggested that this be done next May at the consumer conference. She discussed her request for letters of thanks from the Governor's Office, Senator Harry Reid, and Senator John Ensign for Mike Doyle. She indicated that her desire is to present a variety of awards at the conference so that public recognition is given to the Council members.

Alyce also discussed funding currently allocated in the Council budget for the annual joint retreat between the MHDS Commission and the MHPAC, and indicated that this may be better utilized in the future for events such as the consumer conference. She then discussed more details of the consumer conference, which is scheduled for the first week in May, 2004. Alyce also discussed the use of Andrew Zeiser's services to help contribute to the planning and logistics for the conference. This will be discussed further under item eight of the agenda, executive report. Anna Uptergrove asked if the Council will be working with the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI) Nevada on the conference. Alyce said yes and announced that Joe Tyler was recently elected as the new President of NAMI Nevada. She will be working directly with Joe. Alyce also discussed other partners in the conference. Anna asked if it will be in Las Vegas. Alyce said no, it will be held in Reno.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

Alyce Thomas asked for questions or comments on minutes. None were made. She then asked for a motion to approve.

MOTION: Made by Jenita Rodriguez, seconded by Chris Lovass-Nagy, to approve the minutes as submitted.

MAJORITY VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

ABSTAINED: Gloria Dopf.

III. COUNCIL ELECTIONS: VICE CHAIR AND CHAIR

Alyce Thomas noted that nominations would be made from the floor, as noted on the agenda. She then asked for nominations for the office of Vice Chair. Judge Cooley nominated Barbara Jackson, seconded by Chris Lovass-Nagy. Anna Uptergrove nominated Jenita Rodriguez, seconded by Kevin Crowe. Barbara Jackson nominated Bob Bennett, seconded by Debbie Parra. Alyce Thomas asked for additional nominations, and none were made. Gloria Dopf moved to close the nominations for the office of Vice Chair, seconded by Barbara Jackson.

Alyce noted that each of the candidates would be given the opportunity to speak for up to five minutes about their background. She asked Bob Bennett to begin. Bob discussed his experience

as a consumer with bipolar disorder, and discussed his history within the mental health system. He also discussed a book he wrote about recovery: *Mental Illness: A Guide to Recovery*. He talked about his work on the elimination of seclusion and restraint. He has been a member of the Council for approximately two years. Gloria Dopf asked if he has been a consumer of Nevada services. Bob said he has received outpatient services in Nevada, but not inpatient services.

Alyce then asked Barbara Jackson to speak. Barbara discussed her entry into the California mental health system about 10 years ago. She also discussed her work as a Peer Counselor in California. She then moved to Nevada and entered the system as an outpatient. She also joined NAMI Nevada. Barbara discussed her recent work with the State through the Consumer Assistance Program (CAP). In particular, she talked about her recent work to establish a drop-in center for consumers at Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS). Kevin asked about the drop-in center in more detail. Barbara said it is already underway at the NNAMHS campus in Reno, and that it is intended to be run by consumers. More discussion followed.

Alyce then asked Jenita Rodriguez to speak. Jenita discussed her background as a psychiatric nurse and also as a consumer. She has received services both in California and Nevada. She also discussed her advocacy work at the Nevada Legislature as well as her work in the CAP program. She emphasized her unique life experience as both a provider and a consumer of mental health services.

Andrew Zeiser briefly read from the bylaws to explain the need for a primary vote when three or more candidates are nominated, followed by a general election between the remaining two candidates. He also explained that several Council members had requested a written vote. He noted that Dave Caloiaro volunteered to work with him to serve as an objective third party for counting the votes.

The Council cast their votes and Andrew and Dave left to complete the count. Dave returned to announce that Bob Bennett and Jenita Rodriguez received the highest votes during the primary election. Alyce asked that the Council vote again between Bob and Jenita.

The Council cast their votes again, and Andrew and Dave left to complete the count. Dave returned to announce that Bob Bennett had received the majority of votes and was elected as the new Vice Chair.

MAJORITY WRITTEN VOTE; VICE CHAIR ELECTED: Bob Bennett.

Alyce then asked for nominations for the office of Chair. Jenita Rodriguez nominated Judge Cooley, seconded by Barbara Jackson. Alyce asked for additional nominations, and none were made. Gloria moved to close the nominations for Chair, seconded by Bob.

Alyce asked for a voice vote from the Council members since there is only one candidate.

MAJORITY VOICE VOTE; CHAIR ELECTED: Judge Cooley.

ABSTAINED: Judge Cooley.

Alyce congratulated Judge Cooley, and asked her to speak briefly. Judge Cooley explained that she was a Judge in Michigan for 16 years, and discussed her work with people in the criminal justice system who presented a variety of needs. She also discussed her background in special education. Judge Cooley talked about special programs she worked to develop, including a life skills program for youth coming through the court system designed to help them make better life choices.

She then discussed her personal history of depression that resulted from a threat made on her life by a mentally ill person who had come through her courtroom. She explained that this experience gave her empathy and understanding about how it feels to be unable to control one's life and make good decisions. She discussed her current work with the City of Las Vegas, including being named to a judicial selection committee. She expressed her interest in working with persons with mental illness within the criminal justice system. One of her primary concerns within the field of mental health is that funding be dedicated to the people who need help. She thanked the Council for expressing their faith and confidence in her as the new Chair. Brief discussion followed.

IV. FY 2004 CONSUMER SERVICES PROPOSAL REVIEW

Alyce Thomas began by briefly discussing the proposals received. Andrew Zeiser returned the score sheets submitted by the individual members of the Council and distributed a copy of the ranked score report. He pointed out the difference between the ranked report based on percentile score versus the ranked report based on yes/no recommendations. He explained that in the past the Council had expressed concern that while some proposals were well written, they may not fall within the funding guidelines and therefore members may not wish to fund them. Conversely, some proposals are not as well written but the programs are desirable based on the intent of the funding. He recommended that the Council consider both rankings in order to make their funding decisions.

Gloria Dopf pointed out that two proposals are within the top three of each list: Mental Health Association (MHA) of Greater Nevada and RESTART. She discussed the possibility of the Council targeting these projects since they are ranked highest either way. Gloria also suggested a process of elimination wherein the Council might not consider the bottom ranking proposals within each list. Overall, Gloria recommended that the Council look at scoring patterns that may help consolidate the group's consensus about funding.

Mary Wherry said that while she supported funding many of the proposals with a yes recommendation, she also recommended awarding reduced amounts to help spread out the funds available. She asked that the group consider dividing up the funding across several proposals. Discussion followed about how the funding decisions will be made. Gloria again suggested using the yes/no ranking in order to make the first cut.

Kevin Crowe commented that partial funding of the projects may be adverse to the program goals of the applying organizations, and suggested that the Council try to fully fund projects where possible. Karen Taycher agreed with Kevin's comment, and discussed the hardship experienced when programs receive less funding but are expected to accomplish the same goals.

Judge Cooley agreed with the comments made by Kevin and Karen. Andrew explained that the top four proposals on the ranked score list could be fully funded for a total of \$43,545. This would leave a small remainder from the \$45,000 allocated.

V. FY 2004 CONSUMER SERVICES PROPOSAL AWARDS

Following the discussion above, Mary Wherry made a motion to fund the top four proposals in the ranked score report.

MOTION: Made by Mary Wherry, seconded by Judge Cooley, to fund the top four proposals in the ranked score report as follows: 1) MHA of Greater Nevada, 2) HealthSmart, 3) RESTART, and 4) Nevada Health Centers.

Alyce asked for discussion. Karen asked about the total funding amount required for the top four proposals in the yes/no ranking, leaving out the proposal from A Rainbow Place because it scored lower and requests the entire available amount. Andrew explained this would total \$46,545, which is just over the \$45,000 allocated. Alyce asked if the Council is obligated to expend the funds entirely. Andrew said no, but suggested that they not award significantly over or under the designated amount. He indicated that in years past the Council has gone over slightly, and the budget has historically allowed for this. However, he is aware from discussions with Liz O'Brien at MHDS that the Council's budget is near zero reversion for the previous fiscal year, which will leave no room for overages within the current subgrant funding cycle. Gloria pointed out that the difference to consider is whether Nevada Health Centers or Nevada Recovery Guide gets funded between the two lists. Alyce asked for additional discussion and no more comments were made. She then asked Andrew to reiterate the motion and called for a vote. Andrew reminded the group that anyone with a conflict of interest pertaining to the top four proposals on the ranked score list must abstain from the vote.

MAJORITY VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

ABSTENTIONS: Bob Bennett, Barbara Jackson, Jenita Rodriguez, Alyce Thomas, and Anna Uptergrove.

Karen commented that Andrew's reports were helpful in the decision process. Alyce then called for the scheduled lunch break.

**** The meeting broke at 11:30 am, then resumed at 1:30 pm.*

VI. REVIEW FY 2003 CMHS BLOCK GRANT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT – ANDREW ZEISER

Alyce Thomas asked Andrew Zeiser to begin his discussion. Andrew distributed a draft of the fiscal year (FY) 2003 Implementation Report and briefly reviewed the content. He explained that the format is largely determined by CMHS requirements and reviewed the narrative reporting sections and the data tables that compare the FY 2003 data for performance indicators with the prior year. This comparison determines whether the goals and objectives are considered achieved or not. He said that while some of the data is present in the report, staff is working on gathering the bulk of the 2003 data with an early November deadline. The report is due by December 1, 2003. He indicated that comments on the Implementation Report would be accepted through Friday, November 7, 2003.

He then briefly reviewed the new Uniform Reporting System (URS) tables now required as part of the annual Implementation Report. He discussed some of the service and demographic statistics requested, and explained that in future years these tables are likely to supplant the performance indicators currently reported because CMHS is working to gather national data for uniform comparisons between states. He said he can make these tables available upon request to the Council members, but because of their size he did not want to distribute them to members unless they have a specific interest in them. Mary Wherry asked for a copy and Andrew agreed to forward them to her.

Kevin Crowe spoke briefly about the URS tables and said he would provide a copy of the 2002 data report to the Council as soon as it is available from CMHS. Discussion followed with Mary about the use of Medicaid funding for mental health clients. Kevin said that MHDS has plans to develop a comparative report for the Council that examines more than one year of data. Mary asked about inpatient expenditures versus outpatient expenditures in the performance indicators for criterion five. Kevin and Andrew briefly explained them. Mary asked to see an expenditure figure for inpatient figures for comparison with the community-based information provided. Kevin asked Mary to e-mail him her specific requests for data from MHDS.

Mary asked about how funding decisions are made for grant funds. Andrew explained that historically the Council recommends areas for funding consideration to the Administrators of both MHDS and DCFS, indicating that typically the Chair has set meetings to communicate these priorities on behalf of the Council. As an example, he pointed out that the Consumer Assistance Program (CAP) was originated within the Council and has received block grant funding since its inception. Mary asked if this is done annually or biannually. Andrew said it has typically been done on a two-year cycle based on the legislative sessions, biennial budgets, and a two-year grant application. Alyce discussed the fact that this is an ongoing process. More discussion followed. Mary said she believes the Council should more strictly time its efforts based on the Divisions' budget timeline and that budget enhancements proposed should be made available for feedback from the group. Alyce underscored that the Executive Committee or the Chair typically serves as the entity to provide budget feedback to MHDS and DCFS.

Karen Taycher reminded everyone that in the past the Implementation Report and other grant documents were reviewed in detail during Council meetings, which was often a source of

conflict at meetings. Now an individual feedback period is allotted, which she agrees reduces contention but suggested it might benefit the group to have discussion about specific issues during a meeting. Judge Cooley suggested that key items of feedback that are provided by individual members via e-mail could be set for discussion on future Council agendas. Following up on Mary's comments, Kevin suggested that the Executive Committee and/or the Chair meet with Carlos Brandenburg late this year or early next year to communicate their funding concerns.

Extensive discussion followed between Mary and Kevin. Kevin said that he will suggest to Carlos that MHDS interact with Medicaid in a more structured way regarding the budget process as it relates to Medicaid funding for mental health services.

Karen then asked who is responsible for the narrative within the grant documents, and Andrew indicated that it is a group effort between himself and staff from MHDS and DCFS. He mentioned specific staff members at DCFS that he works with on the narrative. Karen said she felt that the intent of the Neighborhood Care Center Project was not made clear in the Implementation Report, whereas it was discussed in more detail within the grant application. Andrew explained that the Implementation Report is intended to be a summary document and is limited in size by CMHS. Karen said she would like the second bullet point on page 18 of the grant application, related to the Neighborhood Care Center Project, put into the summary on page 13 of the Implementation Report. Mary brought up bullet five and Karen agreed she would like this included as well if there is room. Alyce reminded everyone that the cutoff for additional comments on the Implementation Report is Friday, November 7.

VII. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

Alyce Thomas began by reading a resignation letter from Karen Taycher, explaining that Karen has recommended a new parent representative to take her place. Alyce expressed gratitude to Karen for her years of service and her support in encouraging Alyce to become a member of the Council.

Alyce then asked Kevin Crowe and Bob Bennett to provide the Seclusion and Restraint Subcommittee report. Kevin reminded everyone present that Nevada has received some funding for training on the reduction of seclusion and restraint that was held this past August, which included participants from eight states. Kevin then discussed some of Nevada's efforts toward reducing seclusion and restraint. He also commented that Nevada is among the lowest nationally for seclusion and restraint rates.

Anna Uptergrove asked about alternatives to physical restraint for persons with serious mental illness (SMI). Bob brought up methods including time out, comfort rooms, and de-escalation efforts on the part staff through talking to clients. He then discussed the adverse effects of seclusion and restraint on clients. More discussion followed. Bob discussed the prevalence of post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among consumers as a result of restraint. He also pointed out that restraint teaches clients that violence is an acceptable answer to problem solving. Jenita underscored not only that consumers suffer from PTSD as a result of restraint situations, but also that staff sometimes does as well. She emphasized the importance of training.

Bob also discussed some details of the training held in August. Jenita suggested there may be crisis points with consumers where there are few other options but restraint. Mary Wherry suggested that looking for early warning signs is important to help prevent the use of restraint. She asked if the training was intended only for state facilities, or is it being provided to private community providers. Alyce said her understanding is that this is supposed to be a train-the-trainers program, which will allow for future inclusion of private providers. Bob said at this point the training is just focused on State facilities. Alyce underscored the importance of taking small steps. Mary asked if DCFS is considering utilizing this training program. Jerry Clark said yes. Mary asked if statistics will be reported on restraint by DCFS. Jerry said yes, and they can be provided to the Council.

Barbara Jackson commented on the dehumanizing effect of restraint on consumers. She pointed out that if you treat a person like an animal, they will act like an animal. Kevin briefly discussed the MHDS data reporting on seclusion and restraint. Jerry indicated that DCFS data on seclusion and restraint is provided regularly to the MHDS Commission. More discussion followed.

Alyce then brought up the rescheduling of the Policy Committee meeting. She reminded the members that this Committee will include the Chair, Vice Chair, the Immediate Past Chair (herself), Kevin as the MHDS representative, and Jerry as the DCFS representative. The goals of the Committee include writing a position statement on membership category definitions. She noted that although the new officers do not officially take their positions until the next scheduled Council meeting, she would like to allow the new officers to serve in their new positions as part of the Policy Committee meeting, which will be scheduled prior to the next full meeting of the Council. Judge Cooley suggested that the members provide feedback on their ideas about defining membership categories for consumer and family members.

Mary asked about the purpose of the position statement. Alyce discussed national work on position papers to define membership categories. Andrew explained that the immediate purpose is to define these categories before filling current vacancies on the Council. Mary suggested that this might be included in the bylaws. More discussion followed. Mary asked for a comparison of sample definitions from other states to be provided for review by the Council members. Dave Caloiaro said his understanding is that the Policy Committee will consider national definitions as part of its work. Mary suggested that the Council might consider reviewing these definitions today under this agenda item if Alyce has the definitions available. Andrew stated that this is not included as an action item on today's agenda and that it was originally agreed by the Council that the Policy Committee would develop the definitions and make a recommendation to the Council as a whole. He recommended that the Council not bypass this process, which was previously agreed upon.

Mary again said that in the interest of expediency, the definitions could be distributed to the Council via e-mail for comment and then a special meeting could be scheduled to approve these definitions. She discussed the difficulties of convening a subcommittee. Alyce said the Committee already exists, and her original question to the group was whether they were willing to allow the new Chair and Vice Chair to serve in their new positions on the Committee. Barbara made a motion accordingly.

MOTION: Made by Barbara Jackson, seconded by Mary Wherry, to allow the new Chair and Vice Chair to serve in their new positions as officers of the Council on the Policy Committee established to review Council membership category definitions.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

ABSENT: Gloria Dopf and Barbara Legier.

VIII. EXECUTIVE REPORT – ALYCE THOMAS

Alyce Thomas said that under this item she would like the Council to formally vote on allowing Andrew Zeiser to assist the Consumer Assistance Program (CAP) with the development of the consumer conference next year. Although this was agreed upon by consensus at the last meeting, a Council member had brought up concerns about the appropriateness of this decision after the fact. Alyce briefly explained the matter, pointing out that Andrew has worked to assist Council members with other projects and conferences in the past as part of his duties for the Council. She then asked if any member was willing to make a motion accordingly.

MOTION: Made by Chris Lovass-Nagy, seconded by Judge Cooley, to allow Andrew Zeiser to assist Alyce Thomas and the CAP with the consumer conference scheduled for May, 2004.

ABSENT: Gloria Dopf and Barbara Legier.

Kevin Crowe recommended that issues such as this should be brought up within the Council meetings and should not be brought up for debate after the fact with individual members. Judge Cooley stated that if members have subsequent discussions about issues such as this after meetings, it is not appropriate to bring them up again at future meetings. Private discussions and side agendas will not be entertained at regularly scheduled meetings. More discussion followed.

Alyce then brought up the need to reschedule the new member orientation for recent members who joined the Council. Judge Cooley recommended that the Council membership application should indicate that member orientation is mandatory. She underscored the importance of orientation and ensuring that it is a positive experience for new members.

Alyce moved on to provide an update on the CAP. She said they have recruited staff for the two new Consumer Services Assistant positions in the south. One speaks Spanish fluently and has received services within the Nevada system. Another has worked in the State system and has also received services in Nevada.

Alyce also provided an update on the Ticket to Work program and the Health Insurance for Work Advancement (HIWA) program. More discussion followed.

Alyce returned to discussion of the CAP. She said that recruitment for the Elko position is expected to begin in January. Kevin confirmed that this will bring a total of 10 positions to the program. Alyce said yes, including herself as the Statewide Coordinator.

Alyce concluded her report by expressing her gratitude for the opportunity to work with Council and serve as Chair. She is pleased to allow someone else the opportunity to lead the group. She also expressed her gratitude for the success of the block grant during her tenure as Chair.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

Alyce Thomas asked if there is any further discussion of the drop-in center based on the discussion with Barbara Jackson during the elections under item three. Kevin Crowe said he would like the opportunity to see the facility. Mary Wherry said she would like to know about future funding of the center. More discussion followed.

Judge Cooley commended Alyce for her outstanding work as Chair during the past four years and expressed her appreciation for Alyce's advocacy efforts within the mental health system.

X. PUBLIC COMMENT

Comments were made by public attendees under the agenda items above.

XI. SET DATE, TIME, LOCATION, AND TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING

Alyce Thomas said that the members will be notified via e-mail of the next meeting date, which will be held in the first quarter of 2004.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.